

**MINUTES**  
**BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY**  
**Monday, October 17, 2011**  
**City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604**  
**Green Bay, WI 54301**  
**3:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS:** Michael Welch-Chair, Tom Diedrick, Darlene Hallet, Ann Hartman

**EXCUSED:** Rich Aicher

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Rob Strong, Robyn Hallet, Chip Law, DonElla Payne, Matt Roberts, Stephanie Hummel, Sandy Juno

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

1. Approval of the September 12, 2011 minutes of the Brown County Housing Authority

D. Hallet stated that a correction of T. Diedrick's last name throughout the minutes is needed.

A motion was made by A. Hartman and seconded by T. Diedrick to approval the minutes of the September 12, 2011, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion Carried.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

**REPORTS:**

2. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program

A. Preliminary Applications

D. Payne stated that there were 80 preliminary applications in the month of September.

B. Housing Assistance Payments

D. Payne stated that the HAP expenses for September were \$1,264,382.

C. Housing Assistance Unit Count

D. Payne stated that the unit count was 3,108 for September.

D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance

M. Roberts stated that 42.36 percent passed the initial inspection, 27.57 percent passed the re-evaluation, and the fail rate was 30.08 percent.

E. Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Costs and HUD 52681B

C. Law stated that year-to-date, ICS was \$29,441.21 under budget.

F. Portability Activity

D. Payne stated that in September, there were 167 port outs and 20 port ins.

G. SEMAP Monitoring Report

D. Payne stated that the score for Voucher Utilization is 93.87 percent for the year and HAP Utilization 108.48 percent for the year.

H. Report of the Housing Choice Voucher Family Self-Sufficiency Program

D. Payne stated that there were 95 clients in September, of which 35 have escrow accounts. There were two new contracts. There was a drop in clients because several decided that the requirements were too high.

I. Report on the Housing Choice Voucher Home Ownership Option

D. Payne stated that there were 88 clients participating in the Home Ownership Option in September.

J. VASH Reports

D. Payne stated that there were 17 participants and one new contract.

K. Report on Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations

D. Payne stated that no Langan report was received this month.

A motion had been made by T. Diedrick and seconded by D. Hallet to take the agenda items #3 and #4 out of order due to technical issues in presenting the above charts. Motion carried.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

3. Update and possible action regarding Tenant Protection Vouchers

D. Payne stated that they had a meeting at Woodland Park for the people living in Woodland Park and Trail Creek Apartments that were displaced from the Port Plaza Towers. No one has contacted ICS about wanting to move from their new residences. There is no time limit set for these people regarding contacting ICS if they would want to move from their new home.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

4. Approval of Voucher Payment Standards for 2012

D. Payne stated she reviewed HUD's new Fair Market Rents. There was a drastic drop last year which lead to BCHA's Payment Standards for outside the City of Green Bay being over the 110% limit. This year there wasn't a drop, but not a great increase either. D. Payne is proposing to set the Payment Standards at 100% inside the City limits and 103% outside the City. This will keep the amount of the decrease fairly even between the two Payment Standards, but still maintain the dual Payment Standards. As required by HUD, all clients had been throughout the year that the Payment Standard could decrease.

M. Welch questioned if the number "962" in column 3 for the "2012 FMR 100%" was the only significant decline. R. Hallet clarified that it is not in fact a decrease because the number above it, "984" for "2011 FMR 100%" in fact is incorrect. (It should have started 959), so the 2012 number is in fact a slight increase, not a drop.

R. Hallet questioned that although clients have been informed about this, is ICS anticipating concerns expressed by clients about a decrease in their Housing Assistance payments? D. Payne stated that ICS does anticipate client phone calls and will be explaining the changes in funding to them.

M. Welch stated it would be beneficial to re-state the reason for the different Payment Standards within and outside of the City limits. D. Payne explained this is an effort to de-concentrate the number of Vouchers used within City limits. It would allow more people who are able to, to live outside the City of Green Bay.

A motion was made by D. Hallet and seconded by A. Hartman to approve the Voucher Payment Standards for 2012. Motion carried.

A motion was made by D. Hallet and seconded by A. Hartman to move back to agenda item 2 to finish the remaining reports after the completion of agenda item 4. Motion carried.

5. Discussion and possible action regarding Brown County Administration Committee's request that whenever possible constituent committees meet after normal work hours.

R. Hallet stated that this request to hold the BCHA meetings at a later time came to her attention because staff reviews the minutes of the Administration Committee monthly. This was a concern brought about by Supervisor Rob Miller and agreed upon by the Administration Committee. R. Hallet stated that we do not have to change our time, but it should be brought up for discussion.

A. Hartman questioned if the meeting time has always been at 3:00 P.M. R. Strong confirmed that it had, and that other committees also meet during business hours. R. Strong stated that there have been BCHA meetings held during non-office hours to accommodate the public either when it was requested or if an important/popular issue was being discussed. It is up to the commissioners to decide a meeting time. R. Strong also stated that we do not receive much citizen participation at the BCHA meetings. A. Hartman questioned if this was because of the time or the content. R. Hallet stated that no one has contacted her questioning when the meeting is or had any issue with the time.

D. Hallet stated that we do not need to take action. T. Diedrick questioned whether or not the commissioners change the meeting time to later in the day for a two-to-three month time period to see if citizen participation increases. D. Hallet stated that she would prefer not to change the time. ICS is flexible in their time, but would prefer not to change the time.

R. Strong stated that the feedback he has received from the Administration Committee on this issue is that it would be discouraging community members from joining the BCHA due to the time being during the business day. It would also be difficult for the people being served to make these meeting. D. Payne stated that when the Annual Plan's Public Hearing/ Resident Advisory meeting time was changed to noon this year, there were more citizens in attendance than in previous years with nighttime meetings. M. Roberts explained that in the past ICS offered late office hours one day a week, but this was discontinued because of a lack of clients using these hours.

R. Hallet summarized that the overall experience with meeting times indicates that participation in certain events by clients is in fact better if the meeting is held during the day rather than the evening. M. Welch stated that there are many elderly and disabled people in the population we serve and that meetings during the day may be a better time to serve this population.

T. Diedrick stated that if there is something on a future agenda that may have some public interest, BCHA should move the meeting time to after business hours to better accommodate the public, but leave the normal meeting time as-is. All agreed. M. Welch suggested that this issue be revisited in 6 months to see if we have received any requests for evening meetings.

#### **INFORMATIONAL:**

6. NAHRO Commissioners' Corner articles

R. Hallet stated that she had given out other NAHRO articles, specifically for commissioners in the past, so this is a continuation. One article discusses the importance of training. The other article discusses the Resident Commissioner, which the BCHA is not required to have since it does not have Public Housing, but is still an interesting article.

**BILLS:**

A motion was made by T. Diedrick and seconded by D. Hallet to approve the October bills. Motion carried.

**FINANCIAL REPORT:**

The financial report was received and placed on file.

**STAFF REPORT:**

R. Strong stated that there is a group that would like to do low-income tax credit housing in an existing building in the downtown area. This group is still putting together a competitive application, but would like to see if there is interest from the BCHA in financing and/or project-basing 5 units for this project. This group is looking for as much as a \$500,000 loan from the BCHA for this. R. Strong is trying to see if there is any interest in this project. If yes, there will be more information at a future meeting concerning this project and its details. The BCHA Commissioners all agreed they would be interested in hearing more about this project from the developer.

A. Hartman shared an incident she had heard of regarding a registered sex offender who moved to the area and is not living with his girlfriend who is on the Housing Choice Voucher Program because doing so would disqualify his girlfriend from receiving HCV assistance. She is not happy that a sex offender is living in her neighborhood, but it is good news that the public is learning that such individuals cannot live with recipients of HCV.

M. Welch asked a community member in attendance at the meeting if there was an issue she wished to address. Sandy Juno brought up concerns about the portability issues the Housing Choice Voucher program has been seeing. She is concerned about the number of people coming to the community only to take their voucher and leave (port out) while there are long time members of this community who are not getting the help they need. She would like to know what the BCHA is doing to stop this, and also if more data concerning this issue could be provided.

D. Payne and R. Hallet explained the HUD regulations regarding residency and the requirements we have adopted locally for applicants to prove eligibility for a residency preference. D. Payne stated that she has been communicating with HUD about this issue. She explained she has sent HUD a data package detailing Brown County's portability numbers and her concerns. As a federally regulated program, there is little that the county can do to change this policy. ICS has attempted to have this changed or receive an exemption from this, but thus far HUD has not made any changes regarding this. R. Strong explained he has talked to various congressional representatives about this concern. Other Housing Authorities are experiencing this as well; it seems that people go to where the waiting list is the shortest, stay there for a short time until they can get a voucher and then relocate with their voucher. We expect to start seeing a decrease in port outs now that our waiting list is longer. M. Welch explained that portability data is available within the minutes.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

rah:sjh

**All Other**  
**Financial Status Report**  
**2011 Budget Year**  
**As of September 30, 2011**

**REVENUE**

REVENUE					
	Budget Amount	YTD	Annualized \$	Annualized %	Remaining Budget Balance
Interest	\$ 4,661	\$ 3,297	\$ 4,396	94%	(1,364) 71%
Loan Repayments	\$ -	\$ 30,401	N/A	N/A	30,401 N/A
Revenue on Sale of Property	\$ -	\$ 30,001	N/A	N/A	30,001 N/A
Bond Fees & Other	\$ 6,675	\$ 538	\$ 807	12%	(6,137) 8%

**Total Revenues**

\$ 11,336	\$ 64,236	\$ 4,396	39%	29,036	567%
-----------	-----------	----------	-----	--------	------

**EXPENDITURES**

HO Assistance / DPCC	\$ 30,000	\$ -	0%	30,000	0%
Staff Training	\$ 6,200.00	\$ 339	\$ 453	5,861	5%
Landlord Training	\$ 5,000	\$ -	0%	5,000	0%
Audit	\$ 4,413	\$ -	0%	4,413	0%
FSS - Merit Awards/Log Books	\$ 2,750	\$ -	0%	2,750	0%
Other	\$ 10,197	\$ 5,112	\$ 6,816	5,085	50%

**Total Expenditures**

\$ 58,560	\$ 5,452	\$ 7,269	12%	53,109	9%
-----------	----------	----------	-----	--------	----

Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$ 968,701.13
Restricted Cash Balance	\$ 455,603.31